



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,697	10/06/2000	Walter W. Collins	530055.413R1	1037

500 7590 06/10/2010
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 5400
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER
DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3724	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/10/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/680,697	COLLINS, WALTER W.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Clark F. Dexter	3724		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13, 15-25, 27-29, 34-37, 45, 52, 54, 58-60, 62, 63, 65 and 66 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 23-25, 27-29, 34-37, 45, 52, 54, 58-60, 62, 63, 65 and 66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 12/23/09, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Boyer D. Ashley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724.

2. The Appeal Brief filed on December 23, 2009 has been entered. Upon careful review of the Brief, numerous new issues have been discovered including those raised by applicant's arguments that require further attention. For example, applicant makes numerous arguments directed to the prior art rejections in which the Examiner asserts that the prior art knife can be held and opened using one hand using the notch provided in the prior art blade. Applicant argues that such a function cannot be performed with

one hand. Then, applicant argues that such a function can be performed on applicant's knife using pin 63'. Besides the point that applicant is apparently arguing one side of this issue (i.e., it is possible) when it concerns applicant's knife, and the other side of this issue (i.e., it is not possible) when it concerns the prior art knife, it has further been determined that no support for performing such a one-handed function using the pin 63' appears to exist in the original disclosure and it is respectfully suggested that further addressing of this and other matters is necessary to clarify the issues put in front of the Board.

Additionally, the Examiner has made a number of suggestions to obviate some of the outstanding rejections in order to reduce the remaining issues of the present application for appeal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 23-25, 27-29, 54, 58-60, 62, 63, 65 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 58, 62, 63 and 66, the disclosure still does not appear to provide support for the subject matter set forth in the subject claims. While the applicant has taken the position held by the Examiner in the previous Office action that the claimed “biasing element” refers to the spring, and that the spring can clearly be considered to be a biasing element, the claim remains deficient as follows.

The disclosure does not provide support for the ends of the biasing element (now interpreted by applicant to be the spring 90) being coupled to the handle and blade respectively. That is, there is no single integral feature or plural integral features that couple(s) the end of the spring to the handle, or the end of the spring to the blade. Rather, both ends of the spring 90 are free and are not coupled to anything. Further, the element that is coupled to the handle is pin 95 or the integral combination of pin 95 and sleeve or collar 92, wherein the sleeve or collar 92 is coupled to shaft 80, not to spring 90; similarly, the element that is coupled to the blade is pin 86 or the integral combination of pin 86 and yoke or clevis 82, wherein the yoke or clevis 82 is coupled to shaft 80, not to spring 90. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there remains no support for the claimed subject matter.

To obviate this rejection, the following changes are suggested:

Rewrite the last four lines of claims 58, 62 and 63 as follows:

--a first coupling element operatively coupling ~~a first end of~~ the biasing element to the handle; and

 a second coupling element operatively coupling ~~a second end of~~ the biasing element to the blade.--;

and rewrite the lines 11-14 of claim 66 as follows:

--a first coupling element operatively coupling ~~a first end of~~ the biasing element to the handle;

a second coupling element operatively coupling ~~a second end of~~ the biasing element to the blade.--.

Further, regarding claims 23-25, 27-29 and 65, the original disclosure does not provide support for the combination now set forth in claims 23 and 65 of:

“said blade having an aperture, and
a blade pivot connected to said first end of said handle and extending through the aperture for pivotal movement of said blade about said blade pivot between an extended position wherein the blade is outside of said blade cavity and a retracted position wherein the majority of the blade is substantially within said blade cavity.”

Rather support is provided for the blade having a pivot pin 56 that is connected to the first end of the handle for pivotal movement of said blade about said blade pivot between an extended position and a retracted position.

To obviate this rejection, the following changes are suggested:

Rewrite claim 23 with the first portion amended as follows:

23. (Currently amended) A folding knife, comprising:

a handle having a blade cavity and a first end;

a blade having a first end and a second end opposite said first end; ~~said first end of said blade having an aperture;~~

a blade pivot connected to said first end of said handle and extending from the
first end of the blade through the aperture for pivotal movement of said blade about said
blade pivot between an extended position wherein the blade is outside of said blade
cavity and a retracted position wherein the majority of the blade is within said blade
cavity; and--;

and to rewrite claim 65 with the first portion amended as follows:

65. (Currently amended) A folding knife, comprising:
a handle having a blade cavity and a first end;
a blade having a first end and a second end opposite said first end; ~~said first end~~
~~of said blade having an aperture~~;
a blade pivot connected to said first end of said handle and extending from the
first end of the blade through the aperture for pivotal movement of said blade about said
blade pivot between an extended position wherein the blade is outside of said blade
cavity and a retracted position wherein the majority of the blade is within said blade
cavity; and--.

Additionally, regarding claims 54, 58, 62, 63 and 66, the original disclosure
does not provide support for the subject matter directed to one-hand operation as
follows:

In claim 54, line 3, support for the recitation:

“or a pin coupled to an upper portion of the blade”

which further defines the moving means set forth in claim 52 wherein the moving means
has the function of “for moving the blade from the retracted position to the extended

position with one hand while holding the knife with the same hand" could not be found in the original disclosure.

That is, the original disclosure only provides support for such one-handed operation using the engagement portion C (see the first paragraph on page 10, specifically lines 6-7 thereof), wherein the engagement portion C includes ridges 66, 66'. No support could be found for performing such a one-handed function using the disclosed pin (63', see Fig. 8B).

Similarly, in claim 58, support for the one-handed operation set forth in the following recitation could not be found:

"a contact pin coupled to the blade and extending outward from the blade, positioned such that a user, holding the knife in one hand, can apply an opening force to the blade with a thumb or finger of the same hand".

Similarly, in claim 62, support for the one-handed operation set forth in the following recitation could not be found:

"a contact pin on the blade, positioned such that a user, holding the knife in one hand, can apply an opening force to the blade with a thumb or finger of the same hand".

Similarly, in claim 63, support for the one-handed operation set forth in the following recitation could not be found:

"a contact pin on the blade, extending perpendicular to a plane of travel of the blade and positioned such that a user, holding the knife in one hand, can apply an opening force to the blade with a thumb or finger of the same hand".

Similarly, in claim 66, support for the one-handed operation set forth in the following recitation could not be found:

“a contact pin on the blade, extending perpendicular to a plane of travel of the blade and positioned such that a user, holding the knife in one hand, can apply opening force to the blade with a finger of the same hand”.

It is emphasized that the Examiner’s position is not that the claimed one-handed operation is not possible (in fact the Examiner’s position is that such a function is possible as established in the prior art rejections). Rather, the Examiner’s position is that there is simply no support in the original disclosure for performing the claimed one-handed operation of the disclosed knife using the contact pin (63’) as claimed. It is noted that because applicant argues so vehemently that such a function is not possible using the prior art notch, and since such a notch is considered an alternative and apparently an equivalent embodiment to the contact pin (see Figs. 8A-B), it is believed that this issue needs to be addressed and/or clarified.

Additionally, regarding claim 59, the original disclosure does not provide support for the subject matter directed to tensioning of the spring as follows:

“wherein the biasing element is arranged such that the spring thereof increases in tension to a point of maximum tension as the blade is moved through the arc from the retracted position toward the extended position, then decreases in tension as the blade continues past the point of maximum tension toward the extended position.”

Rather, support is provided for the spring increases in compression to a point of maximum compression (e.g., wherein an increased compression condition of the spring is shown in Fig. 4B), then decreases in compression (e.g., as shown in Figs. 4A and 4C).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 34, 36 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown, pn 1,864,011.

Regarding claims 34 and 36, Brown '011 discloses a folding knife with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

a handle (e.g., structure including 9, 10);

a blade (1, 1) pivoted on said handle for movement between stowed and deployed conditions relative to the handle; and

an elongate, force-transmitting biasing spring (e.g., 8) having a variable length, the spring operatively attached between said blade and said handle, where said spring exhibits both an increase and a decrease in the length of the spring, as said blade is moved from the stowed condition to the deployed condition (e.g., the spring increases in length until the blade is half opening wherein the upper blade 1 would be extending

upwardly in Fig. 1 generally orthogonal to the handle, and the spring decreases in length as the blade is moved from the half open position to the fully open position);

[claim 36] wherein the operative attachment of said spring to said blade comprises a plunger (e.g., the left portion of 3, or the right portion of 3 as viewed in Fig. 1 operatively interconnecting the spring to the blade.

Regarding claim 45, Brown '011 discloses a folding knife with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

a handle (e.g., structure including 9, 10);

a blade (e.g., 1, 1) pivotally coupled to the handle to be moveable about a blade pivot point (e.g., 11, 11), such that the blade moves between a stowed position (e.g., shown in Fig. 1) and a deployed position;

a plunger (e.g., the left portion of 3, or the right portion of 3 as viewed in Fig. 1) coupled between the handle and the blade such that a portion of the plunger remains a fixed distance from the blade pivot point (e.g., the left portion of 3 remains a fixed distance from the right pivot point 11, particularly during pivoting of the upper blade 1 about the right pivot point; and the right portion of 3 remains a fixed distance from the left pivot point 11, particularly during pivoting of the lower blade 1 about the left pivot point); and

a spring (e.g., 8) coupled to the plunger to act on the blade to urge the blade into the stowed position when the blade is moved to the stowed position, and operates on the blade to urge the blade toward the deployed position when the blade is moved by an outside force from the stowed position at least partially toward the deployed position.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Brown, pn 1,864,011 (hereafter Brown '011) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Brown '011 in view of Thompson et al., pn 5,131,149 (hereafter Thompson '149).

Brown '011 discloses a folding knife with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

a handle (e.g., structure including 9, 10);
a blade (e.g., 1, 1) having a tang coupled to the handle, the blade configured to rotate, relative to the handle, between a retracted position (e.g., shown in Fig. 1) and an extended position; biasing means (e.g., 8) for holding the blade in the retracted position in the handle while the blade is in the retracted position and for biasing the blade toward the extended position relative to the handle when the blade is moved from the retracted position past a point of maximum bias toward the extended position; and

moving means (e.g., the notch located on the blade between numerals 1 and 7, wherein the notch can clearly be accessed by a finger of a user's hand and pushed toward an open/extended position while the user is holding the knife in the same hand)

for moving the blade from the retracted position to the extended position with one hand while holding the knife with the same one hand.

In the alternative, if it is argued that the stated moving means of Brown '011 does not meet the claim under application of 112, 6th paragraph, the Examiner takes Official notice that such moving means are old and well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including facilitating opening of a folding knife. As one example, Thompson '149 discloses a blade having such a moving means in the form of a plurality of ridges on a first end of the blade and teaches that it facilitates one-handed actuation of the blade. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a moving means including a plurality of ridges on the blade of Brown '011 for the benefits taught by Thompson '149 including that described above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, pn 1,864,011 (Brown '011) in view Thompson et al., pn 5,131,149 (hereafter Thompson '149).

Brown '011 lacks the first end of the blade having an extension with a plurality of ridges thereon or a plurality of directional saw-like teeth or a pin coupled to an upper portion of the blade. Thompson '149 discloses a blade having such a plurality of ridges on a first end of the blade and teaches that it facilitates one-handed actuation of the blade. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to

provide an extension having a plurality of ridges on the blade of Brown '011 for the benefits taught by Thompson '149 including that described above.

10. Claims 58, 59, 62 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, pn 1,864,011 (Brown '011) in view of Yablonovitch, pn 5,009,008 or Ennis, pn 5,095,624.

Regarding claims 58 and 59, Brown '011 discloses a folding knife with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

a handle (e.g., structure including 9, 10);
a blade (e.g., 1, 1) having a tang end coupled to the handle, the blade configured to rotate, relative to the handle, through an arc between a retracted position (e.g., shown in Fig. 1) and an extended position when an opening force is applied to the blade;
a biasing element including a spring (e.g., 8);
a first coupling element (e.g., the leftmost portion of 3) operatively coupling a first end of the biasing element to the handle; and
a second coupling element (e.g., the rightmost portion of 3) operatively coupling a second end of the biasing element to the blade;
[claim 59] wherein the biasing element is arranged such that the spring thereof increases in tension to a point of maximum tension as the blade is moved through the arc from the retracted position toward the extended position, then decreases in tension as the blade continues past the point of maximum tension toward the extended position.

Regarding claim 62, Brown '011 discloses a folding knife with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

- a handle (e.g., structure including 9, 10);
- a blade (e.g., 1, 1) having a tang end coupled to the handle, the blade configured to rotate, relative to the handle, through an arc between a retracted position (e.g., shown in Fig. 1) and an extended position when an opening force is applied to the blade;
- a biasing element including a spring (e.g., 8), configured to apply a closing force to the blade while the blade is in the retracted position;
- a first coupling element (e.g., the leftmost portion of 3) operatively coupling a first end of the biasing element to the handle; and
- a second coupling element (e.g., the rightmost portion of 3) operatively coupling a second end of the biasing element to the blade.

Regarding claim 63, Brown '011 discloses a folding knife with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

- a handle (e.g., structure including 9, 10);
- a blade (e.g., 1, 1) having a tang end coupled to the handle, the blade configured to rotate, relative to the handle, through an arc between a retracted position (e.g., shown in Fig. 1) and an extended position when an opening force is applied to the blade;
- a biasing element including a spring (e.g., 8), configured to resist rotation of the blade toward the extended position while the blade is in the retracted position;

a first coupling element (e.g., the leftmost portion of 3) operatively coupling a first end of the biasing element to the handle; and

a second coupling element (e.g., the rightmost portion of 3) operatively coupling a second end of the biasing element to the blade.

Brown lacks:

a contact element on the blade, positioned such that a user, holding the knife in one hand, can apply an opening force to the blade with a finger of the same hand.

However, such contact pins are old and well known in the art and facilitate removing the blade from the handle. Yablonovitch and Ennis each discloses one example of such a contact pin. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such a contact pin on the knife of Brown to gain the well known benefits such as that described above as well as those described in Yablonovitch and Ennis.

11. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Brown, pn 1,864,011 (hereafter Brown '011) in view of Yablonovitch, pn 5,009,008 or Ennis, pn 5,095,624 as described above for claim 58, and further in view of Thompson et al., pn 5,131,149 (Thompson '149).

The combination lacks the first end of the blade having an extension with a plurality of ridges thereon or a plurality of directional saw-like teeth or a pin coupled to an upper portion of the blade. Thompson '149 discloses a blade having such a plurality of ridges on a first end of the blade and teaches that it facilitates one-handed actuation of the blade. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art to provide an extension having a plurality of ridges on the blade of Brown '011 for the benefits taught by Thompson '149 including that described above.

12. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Brown, pn 1,864,011 (Brown '011) in view of Yablonovitch, pn 5,009,008 or Ennis, pn 5,095,624 as described above for claim 63 and, if necessary, further in view of Cassady, pn 5,293,690 (hereafter Cassady '690) or Howard, pn 4,985,998.

It is noted that claim 66 is a combination of claim 63 with the addition of a locking member as claimed at the end of claim 66, and the prior art combination applied to claim 63 teaches a knife with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention as described above for claim 63 but lacks a locking member as claimed. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that such locking members are old and well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including facilitating cutting and manipulating the knife during cutting while avoiding inadvertent closing of the knife interrupting the cutting operation and/or causing injury to the user. It is noted that there are two subclasses (160, 161) in class 30 directed specifically toward such locking mechanisms. Cassady '690, Ennis and Howard each discloses an example of one of the various types of such locking mechanisms. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such a locking member on the knife of Brown '011 for the well known benefits including those described above.

Issues Relating to Reissue Application

13. Claims 23-25, 27-29, 34, 36, 37, 45, 52, 54, 58-60 and 62-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based.

See *Pannu v. Storz Instruments Inc.*, 258 F.3d 1366, 59 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to claim subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope of claim subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

Each of reissue claims 23, 34, 45, 52, 58 and 62-66 is an independent claim that fails the Third Step of the test set forth by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (see MPEP 1412.02). Specifically, at least one of the limitations added during the prosecution of the patent to distinguish over the prior art (that is, at least one of the surrender-generating limitations) was:

“the first end of the plunger being slidably carried by said pivotal connector as said blade moves between said retracted and extended positions.”

It is noted that while reissue claim 12, which is NOT rejected as being an improper recapture, is broader than patent claim 1 in the area of surrender, it does not entirely omit the limitation but rather sets forth that the first end of the plunger *assembly* is slidably and pivotally connected to the *handle*, rather than being slidably connected to a pivotal connector that is connected to the handle. Thus, claim 12 merely recites a broader form of the key limitation added/argued during original prosecution to overcome an art rejection. It is noted that reissue claim 12 is considered narrower than patent claim 1 in other respects; specifically, the subject matter in the third paragraph of the claim which recites that the plunger assembly is configured to maintain the blade in the extended position . . . , and to retain the blade in the retracted position Therefore, claim 12 is NOT considered to be a claim that impermissibly recaptures what was previously surrendered and therefore is NOT barred under 35 U.S.C. 251.

However, none of reissue claims 23, 34, 45, 52, 58 and 62-66 include a recitation relating to the surrender-generating limitation recited above. Thus, these claims impermissibly recapture what was previously surrendered, and are barred under 35 U.S.C. 251.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 1-13 and 15-22 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Remarks

15. The Examiner's intention is to substantially reduce issues for appeal and feels that a number of issues can be easily resolved as suggested above. Applicant is welcome to contact the Examiner for further clarification on any issues or to discuss ways to obviate these issues. Further, regarding the issue of opening a knife with one hand using the notch in a conventional blade, applicant is invited to carefully attempt such an act with an appropriately sized pocket knife or folding knife. While performing such a function may be difficult and could be somewhat dangerous with certain knives, it is clearly possible. The Examiner as well as his co-workers have successfully performed such a one-handed opening operation.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark F. Dexter whose telephone number is (571)272-4505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/Clark F. Dexter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724**

cfd
May 27, 2010